	Case 2:23-cv-01887-DJC-CSK Doc	ument 33	Filed 04/07/25	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	ANTHONY SILVA, et al.	No	o. 2:23-cv-01887-	DJC-CSK
12	Plaintiffs,			
13	V.	<u>OF</u>	<u>RDER</u>	
14	STANISLAUS COUNTY, et al.,			
15	Defendants.			
16 17				
17	Defendants request that the (Court perm	nit late disclosure	of rebuttal witnesses
19	and extend the time for parties to complete expert discovery. (ECF No. 31.) Plaintiffs			
20	have opposed these requests. (ECF No. 32.)			
21	Defendants disclosed a rebuttal witness, Dr. Robert Shavelle, PhD, to Plaintiffs			
22	two business days after the deadline to do so. Defendants represent that the failure to			
23	timely disclose this expert was due to an internal miscommunication at the office of			
24	counsel. Given the de minimus nature of this delay and the absence of any prejudice			
25	to Plaintiffs, the Court will grant Defendants' request to permit the late disclosure of			
26	Dr. Robert Shavelle, PhD.			
27	Defendants also request that the Court extend the expert discovery completion			
28	date by over two months from April 18, 2025 to June 27, 2025. Defendants make this			
		1		
		'		

Case 2:23-cv-01887-DJC-CSK Document 33 Filed 04/07/25 Page 2 of 2

request on the grounds that Defendants' Counsel is scheduled to be engaged in a trial currently set to commence on April 14, 2025. The Court denies this request as Defendants have not shown good cause to modify the scheduling order. The Court is familiar with the trial referenced by Defendants' Counsel as it is before the undersigned. The trial date in that matter has been scheduled since October 27, 2023. Counsel's law firm also has significant resources at its disposal such that a longstanding trial date in one matter should not prevent Counsel from meeting discovery obligations and deadlines in this case. Defendants' request would also significantly prejudice Plaintiffs as it would, at a minimum, require the dispositive motion filing deadline of June 27, 2025, to be moved as Defendants request to extend the expert discovery deadline to that same date. Further modifications of the schedule, including the trial date, would likely be necessitated as well. As such, Defendants have not shown good cause to modify the scheduling order and extend the expert discovery completion date.

Accordingly, Defendants' Motion (ECF No. 31) is GRANTED as to the late disclosure of Dr. Robert Shavelle, PhD as an expert rebuttal witness and DENIED as to Defendants' request to continue the expert discovery completion date.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **April 7, 2025**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE